

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

Well, the hon. the Minister may at least take the earliest opportunity that offers itself before him and appoint a suitable man for the place in the interests of the students and the country at large."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur T. N. SIVAGNANAM PILLAI :—"That is the sum and substance of what I said. I shall bear his request in mind."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I suppose the hon. Minister is one who says little and does much. On that supposition I accept his assurance and withdraw the Resolution." (Cheers.)

The Resolution was by leave withdrawn.

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE
TANJORE DISTRICT.

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :-- "Sir, I beg to move—

12. *That this Council recommends to the Government that the collection of land revenue at the enhanced rate in the Tanjore district from January 1924, be suspended for one year at least till the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation.*

3 p.m.

"Sir, most of the things which I will have to say on this Resolution have already been discussed yesterday and on two or three occasions in the last Council, and the principle underlying this Resolution, that the resettlement coming into force as the result of the resettlement operations ought to be postponed till the principles governing the resettlement are put on a legislative basis, has been accepted by this House by a very large majority yesterday, so that I think it is not necessary for me to dilate again on the question why the principles of settlement ought to be put on a legislative basis. It has been accepted by a very large majority and I now propose to refer to a few facts which may, I submit, influence hon. Members of this House to decide on the very same principle. I will give the House a few further grounds which will make them go to the extent of saying that this principle ought to be applied to every district. There is a general impression, and I do not say it is absolutely unfounded, that Tanjore is one of the most fertile districts of this Presidency. I do not say it is not. It is a fertile district and compared with many other districts it is more fertile than the others. But at the same time we have to consider the rate of taxation we have to pay in the Tanjore district and how it compares with the land-tax paid in other districts. In this connection I should like to go a little further back, that is, to the period of the last resettlement operations, about the year 1891. The total assessment paid by the Tanjore district at that time was about 45 lakhs. The settlement period had come and the correspondence between the Madras Government and the Government of India began from the year 1888 and the Madras Government thought that Tanjore was very highly taxed even then and decided that in any event the tax ought not to be increased in that district. That was the recommendation of the Madras Government; but the Government of India thought otherwise; they thought, perhaps, for the purpose of squeezing out the provincial revenues as contribution to the Indian Exchequer, that settlement should go on and they decided to increase the tax in that district by 18 lakhs. The Madras Government did not approve of the action of the Government of India and said that if there was to be any increase at all, it ought not to go beyond 11 lakhs; and actually the increase came to about

14th December 1923] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

12 lakhs. In their report, the Madras Government have said that Tanjore was already heavily assessed and considering the prosperity to be assured to the small holders of that district, they would not be justified in increasing the assessment. In spite of the protests of the Madras Government, they were forced to raise the tax by 29 per cent, so much so that even in the year 1891 the tax was raised by 29 per cent, which ought not to have been done. What is now proposed to be done is to raise the tax by another 25 per cent in the case of some lands and by $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent in the case of the other lands. Now, the question before this House is whether it is justifiable to raise the assessment in that district. To show that Tanjore is already paying a heavy rate of assessment, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a few figures in the report of the settlement operations for the year 1920-21. Hon. Members will find from the report that the total cultivated area of ryotwari land in this Presidency is about 26 million acres and the net revenue, excluding the water-cess and other miscellaneous taxes, is about 55 millions; so much so that in the average for the Presidency, the land tax is about Rs. 2 or Rs. 2-1-0 per acre. For Tanjore district alone the assessment that is now being levied is about 55 lakhs or $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions. The extent of cultivated area both wet and dry is about 1,100,000 acres. This works up to an average of Rs. 5-8-0 per acre, whereas the average for the Presidency is only Rs. 2 or Rs. 2-1-0, that is to say, Tanjore is paying 275 per cent of the tax which other districts are paying. What is proposed to be done now under the present resettlement is to raise the assessment by another 12 lakhs. That is, the total assessment under the new settlement, if it comes into force, will be 67 lakhs, so that the rate of taxation will come to about Rs. 6-12-0 per acre. Is this justifiable? Whatever the fertility of the Tanjore district may be compared with other districts, I submit to the House with some confidence that it will require a very strong case for the Government to make out before they can increase the taxation. A perusal of the report of the Settlement Officer himself—he himself made it with certain hesitation—will enable hon. Members of this House to think that I am justified in making the demand which I am now making. I need not now enter into the details of the various settlement operations. They have been discussed clearly yesterday by Mr. Legh. The first operation in the settlement process is the classification of lands, and as regards the classification of lands, Mr. Jackson, the Settlement Officer, and the Collector of Tanjore, say that the classification of lands is not satisfactory and that the lands in the higher classes have to be reduced to lower classes and that the classification of irrigation sources is not correct. The Settlement Officer says that if ryots apply for the lower classes, then such a classification will have to be gone into. Mr. Dutt, in his report, says that irrespective of any applications from ryots for lower classification or with regard to the irrigation sources, it is the duty of the Settlement Officer to lower or take the necessary action. So that both the Collector and the Settlement Officer feel convinced that in some cases at least the classification ought to be lowered both as regards the nature of the soil and the irrigation sources.

“ After the classification of the soil, the standing outturn for each classification of lands is taken to be the basis of the outturn for that land. I may quote an example and make myself clearer. The lands in the Tanjore district are divided into various classes bearing various rates of assessment, ranging

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

from Rs. 14 to Rs. 3 an acre. The first-class lands pay Rs. 14 an acre. They are expected to yield a standing outturn of 1,300 Madras measures per acre. And this does not take into account the harvesting charges which are paid in grain on the harvesting field itself. The harvesting charges come to, roughly, about 6 per cent. Adding this, the average yield for a first-class land in the Tanjore district ought to be about 1,400 Madras measures per acre. It makes the mouth of any Tanjore ryot water to be told that 1,400 Madras measures could be got out of one acre. In Tanjore, according to the calculation there, this comes to 59 kalams an acre, or about 19 kalams per mah. I submit this with confidence that no mirasdar has yet actually realized this quantity. These are all calculations for the first-class lands. As regards inferior lands, lands paying Rs. 8, 7, 6 per acre, Mr. Jackson himself shows in page 44 of his report that the standard outturn which is taken as the basis for settlement operations is more than what is ascertained by actual experience. For the Rs. 6 land the standard outturn is 600 measures. The outturn for three blocks which were taken for the purpose of experimenting is 392, 431, 455 measures, so that the actual yield in one case was below two-thirds and in the other below three-fourths than the standard outturn. For the Rs. 7 land the standard outturn is 700 measures per acre. But the real outturn is 471. Thus hon. Members will see that the standard outturn is at least 30 per cent more than the actual outturn. Of course he gives the statement that the lands have not been properly cultivated, and he says that these details are taken from the lands taken by the Manganallur farm for the purpose of experimenting cultivation. I think a reference to these figures alone shows that the standard outturn has been put too high.

“The next question is about the commutation prices. The standard outturn is taken and that is converted into the market value according to the commutation rates. The commutation rate in this case has been calculated on the basis of the prices ranging during the twenty years prior to the settlement. Mr. Jackson himself in his settlement report says that the prices in the year 1918-19 were very high. Considering that during the next year, i.e., 1919-1920, the prices were the same as those in the previous year he had not chosen to decrease the rates. I may submit that if the prices ruling in the year 1918-19 were excluded, the average price would be decreased. The price in 1918-19 was Rs. 4-8-0 or Rs. 4-12-0 per kalam, whereas the average for the previous years was Rs. 3 or Rs. 3-8-0. The year 1918-19 was an abnormal year and one of the reasons that contributed to the rise in prices was the war. In the settlement report Mr. Jackson hopes that the same prices may continue. In this connexion it is necessary for me to refer to the question whether the same prices are likely to continue in future. My opinion is that they do not and will not. My reasons are these. The chief market for the Tanjore paddy and rice was Ceylon. During the war it was considered necessary to prevent export of rice to Ceylon. Thus from 1915-16 there was an embargo on export of rice to Ceylon. Ceylon which was depending on Tanjore paddy and rice had to seek other sources and she went in for Burma rice. The Ceylon Government thought that, instead of depending entirely on foreign countries for its rice, it might extend cultivation. Thus not only is the Burma rice holding the Ceylon market, but cultivation also has been extended in Ceylon. Sir P. Ramanathan when he

14th December 1923] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

was here told me that the Ceylon Government is giving encouragement to cultivators to cultivate paddy, and in the course of a few years Ceylon will be able to maintain herself without depending upon other countries for its rice. Now, when the chief market for the Tanjore rice has been taken away and when the various causes which contributed to the rise in prices in the Tanjore district during the years 1915 to 1919—the war has ceased and I hope it will not recur again—have disappeared, what guarantee is there, what justification is there, for supposing that the abnormal prices that ruled, during the last four or five years will continue to rule?

3-15 p.m. I am not raising my arguments merely on what may happen or may not happen. I may say for the information of hon. Members of this House that the prices have gone considerably down. Paddy was selling at this season last year at Rs. 3 or Rs. 3-8-0. What is the price now? Samba paddy sells at Rs. 2-8-0 and kuruvai paddy at Rs. 1-15-0 or Rs. 2 per kalam, so that even during the present year the prices have gone considerably down. I am afraid that prices will not hereafter go up unless for some extraordinary reason. How can you expect the same prices which have been ruling during the last five or six years to continue for ever? The commutation prices which have been taken for the purpose of settlement have been based on an average of these high prices ruling for the last five or six years and it comes to Rs. 1-15-0. If a slight reduction is made in this commutation price, the margin which is supposed to be left to the land-holder will be reduced to a very insignificant figure.

“I think, it is necessary, Sir, to go into some more figures and they are these. Hon. Members will find from page 55 of Mr Jackson's report that the majority of the wet lands are of ordinary variety and they are classed as Class 5 land and the assessment per acre is fixed as Rs. 8. According to the report of the Settlement Officer, the margin that will be left to the land-holder after paying the assessment as shown in the last column of the report is Rs. 4-15-0. In column 7 a deduction of Rs. 10 has been made as equivalent to the landlord's share of revenue, so that for one acre of land paying Rs. 8 assessment, the landlord will get after paying an enhanced assessment of Rs. 10 a margin of Rs. 14-15-0. After making all the calculations, if his figures are correct, the landlord is left with only Rs. 14-15-0. If there is a slight deduction made in the commutation price to the extent of half or one anna per kalam, this Rs. 14-15-0 will be reduced. His total outturn in Madras measures is about 34 kalams or about 800 Madras measures, and if a deduction of one anna be made in the cost per kalam the profit will be considerably reduced and it will come to about Rs. 12 or Rs. 13.

“There is one other matter which I want this House to consider and that is this : after the value of paddy is commuted at the commutation rate, deductions are made for expenses of cultivation. This question of expenses of cultivation seems to be a very vexed question in the matter of the settlement. The old and the new rates are given by Mr. Jackson in pages 48 to 50 of his report. This old rate is put down at Rs. 14 per acre. He takes the various items and gives one of the items, viz., the cost of bulls as Rs. 1-5-6 per acre. The basis of his calculation seems to be this : a pair of bulls would cost Rs. 40 and this pair will plough about 5 acres and the

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

animals will last for about six years; therefore the rate per acre for the landlord would be Rs. 1-5-4. In this connexion I wish to point out that he has entirely forgotten to take into account the allowance for the feeding of the bulls. Can the bulls be fed on straw alone? There is no allowance made for the feeding of the bulls. And now for the purpose of the present calculation he raised it to Rs. 2-11-0 per acre on the basis that the cost of bulls has considerably increased. I respectfully place before this House that this allowance is entirely inadequate and ought to be at least five times of what he has given. Hon. Members will be aware of the fact that a pair of bulls cannot be purchased for Rs. 40 or Rs. 80 now, but it costs Rs. 100 or Rs. 130. There is another fallacy in this calculation, viz., that it does not make allowance for the capital invested by the landlord in the purchase of bulls. Suppose a poor ryotwari landlord invests Rs. 120 or Rs. 130 in the purchase of bulls, is he not expected to get a return on the capital invested by way of interest? If these calculations are made, the rate for bulls per acre will not be so low, and it ought to be Rs. 10 per acre or more."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Do I understand the hon. Member to say that the cost of bulls alone is Rs. 10 per acre?"

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR:—"Yes; Mr. Jackson in his report says that he has based his calculation for cultivation expenses on the statistics furnished by the various agricultural farms and co-operative societies. There is a co-operative society in Mayavaram which gives an account of cultivation expenses and the cultivation expenses as given by it is considerably more than what is put by him as the basis. Mr. Jackson brushes it aside saying 'if this be the cultivation expenses, I will have to assume that the cultivators of Tanjore district are working the lands at a loss'. So, under these circumstances, I beg to emphasise that the figures given by the Settlement Officers are not correct.

"Beyond what has been taken into account, he says, there are certain lands called Manyams for each cultivator which come to about 20 or 30 cents. It is true Mr. Jackson says that such Manyams exist and they are given to cultivators free, but they are given as a sort of retainer to these cultivators and it is not necessary to take them into account. It is impossible for any landlord to get his servants as and when he requires. A man cultivating 5 acres of land is given 30 cents as Manyam. In calculating the standard outturn of one acre we must calculate in this way, viz., that out of one acre the cultivator takes away 5 or 6 cents and therefore we should take into account only the remaining land. Supposing a tenant cultivates 5 acres of land he is given 20 or 30 cents and the yield from these 20 or 30 cents is given to him besides other payments. Mr. Jackson says that these are unnecessary expenses.

"There is one other thing as regards the expenses and it is this: as I have already said, the cultivation expenses have not been given correctly. Then with regard to the margin which would be left to the landlord, he says for an acre of land after paying Rs. 10 he gets Rs. 14-15-0. He does not take into account the various cesses which the landlord has to pay. He does not take into account the railway-cess, the road-cess, and the education-cess which has been imposed already in certain taluks of the Tanjore district and the latter of which comes to one-fourth anna in the rupee. If

14th December 1923] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

these charges are deducted, there will be a further reduction from the margin. Supposing the figures given by Mr. Jackson are correct, i.e., the cultivation expenses, the standard of outturn, and all other expenses connected with cultivation, the landlord for one acre of land, after paying Rs. 10 assessment will have a margin of Rs. 13.

"Then Mr. Jackson himself says that the value of land paying Rs. 10 assessment is about Rs. 1,100 per acre. Then it comes to this: if a person invests Rs. 1,100 on one acre of land his profit will be Rs. 13. Will any body that has a knowledge of business methods be willing to take Rs. 13 or Rs. 14 as his return for that investment, not to speak of the personal trouble the landlord himself takes for the cultivation of the land? I submit, not, Sir. If that be so, I do not think any Government with any sense of fairness or care for the prosperity and welfare of the cultivating classes will allow this to go on.

"There is one other matter which I wish to say and that is this: it may be that some of the landlords of the Tanjore district are rich owning 2,000 and 3,000 acres and however high the land tax may be even after paying such an enhanced tax, they may be able to get a fair margin left for their maintenance. But I ask in all seriousness, what is the position of the majority of the landlords? They are people paying less than Rs. 10 assessment, that is to say, people possessing 1 or $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres of land; and what is the margin left to them? It is about Rs. 20 or Rs. 30. Can anybody consider this to be sufficient for the maintenance of their families? I do not think it is necessary for me to say that this margin of Rs. 25 or Rs. 30 is hardly enough to maintain a family. I may say without any exaggeration that most of the poor ryots are hardly having one meal a day in the district of Tanjore. It may be that people travelling through the district, visit only the towns and consider it prosperous. It requires some trouble to go to the interior of the district and see the huts occupied by the poor ryots and anybody who has seen them will certainly not sanction any proposal for enhancing the rates now levied in spite of the glamour which prevails in the minds of some with regard to the supposed richness of the Tanjore district.

"Sir, there is one argument which may probably be urged against my proposal and which was urged against the Resolution of the hon. Member for Bellary; that, other districts have been resettled and they are paying a higher rate of taxes, and why should Tanjore alone be exempted. I would meet that argument by saying that Tanjore is paying 275 per cent as much as other districts. Further, I do not think that the principle of setting one district against another and creating inter-district jealousies will pay in the long run. The same argument may be applied to the Government of India. In the Legislative Assembly, Members from the other provinces say: 'why should Madras profit? Why should we reduce the Impost from Madras? Why should Allahabad, Calcutta and Bombay vote for a Resolution asking for a reduction of the Madras Impost? It is only a Madras matter.' How do we relish their view? Nobody considers that the other provinces are right in saying that they would not consider the case of Madras. I ask hon. Members to show the same feeling towards Tanjore and tell the Government that they will not be justified in enhancing the assessment in Tanjore, which district, the Government itself said in 1891, was already groaning under heavy

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

taxation. My Resolution is very modest and it does not go to the extent of saying 'there ought to be a remission of taxation.' All that I say is that till the principles of land revenue settlement are placed on a legislative basis, the resettlement may be suspended, and if, according to the principles which that legislation may contain, they think it fit that taxation in Tanjore ought to be raised, let them do it."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Retrospectively?"

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"Retrospectively, if necessary. It is true that the Government may plead financial difficulties. I understand in the last Budget there was a deficit of 30 to 35 lakhs in this Presidency and if my information be correct or if the Retrenchment Committee has been doing any real work in that direction there ought to be a retrenchment of at least 60 or 70 lakhs this year. So that, we will not have a deficit Budget this year. Now, what is it that I have asked for? I ask merely that the increased assessment of 12 lakhs may not be collected this year, and that if after considering all the circumstances in the light of the principles embodied in the Bill—and the hon. the Law Member promises to introduce legislation for this purpose during this Session—this House comes to the conclusion that Tanjore should pay more, this House may take the liberty of asking the Tanjore ryots to pay with retrospective effect. I see no such occasion arising. I am sure if the principles are to be applied to Tanjore, there will be no case made out for increase and my hope will be eventually found to be perfectly right. Therefore I venture to hope that this House will unanimously accept my Resolution in spite of any opposing speeches from the Government benches."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, if I rise at this stage to second this Resolution, notwithstanding the attitude, by no means sympathetic, on the part of the Government as it appears from the answer which the hon. the Law Member gave us to-day to an interpellation made by the hon. Member for the University touching this identical point, it is because of the strong feeling that I entertain that the cause of the Tanjore ryot is just and reasonable. The support which the House gave almost by a sweeping majority yesterday to Resolution No. 6 moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, which endorsed, and not only endorsed, but also reaffirmed, this essential point, viz., the necessity for the land revenue settlement being codified and placed on a legislative basis, also encourages me to give my support to this Motion. If I remember rightly, if I understand these principles correctly, I am reminded on this occasion of an application for stay order which we as lawyers often make before courts of appeal, and I therefore take this Resolution in the light of a regular appeal having been lodged by the Tanjore mirasidars in particular, to this House against an order of the Government which the Government wants to execute at once. This is therefore in the nature of an application for a stay order sought to be supported on two main grounds, the first ground being that practically the grievances of the Tanjore mirasidars have not been redressed and the second being that this House wants to show to the Government their firm resolve and determination that these settlement operations should no longer go on under executive orders, but that they should be subject to the legislative sanction. So far as the second part of my argument is concerned, this House has in no uncertain terms placed its seal of approval. As

14th December 1923] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

regards the main point, we have made out a sufficiently strong and *prima facie* case such as to warrant the stay of settlement operations for one year only. For, I find the Resolution is a modest one. It only desires that the introduction of the enhanced rates may be kept in abeyance for a period of one year, at least till the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation. The reason why the hon. the Mover has fixed the period at one year was probably because he conceived that it might take at least a year, if not more, for any legislation being brought to this Council and passed. If I remember aright, just almost a year ago, almost to a day, Sir Habib-ul-lah stated that the introduction and passing of such a measure might take at least one year, and probably it is in the light of that this Resolution has been worded. Now, we have heard the hon. the Law Member telling us the other day, and which the hon. the Home Member also reiterated, that one such Bill is almost ready. That a Land Revenue Bill, whatever its provisions may be, so far as I am concerned, I have not been taken into the confidence. . . . ”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“I do not think that I said ‘almost ready’. Mr. Siva Rao said that.”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“In answer to an interpellation that I put, the hon. the Law Member gave us a list of 14 legislative measures that are likely to come up this Session. One of the Bills mentioned therein was dealing with land revenue.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“It was included in the list of legislative measures Government intend to put forward in this Session.”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I lay stress on the words ‘this Session’. This Session means three months, and I do not think it will be introduced during the Budget sitting. I think it is but fair to pass legislation in this matter to prevent Government going on with settlement operations and enhancing settlement rates and to impress upon the Government the desirability and the necessity of their no longer being permitted to have things all their own and in their own fashion and under executive orders. I think it is to lay stress on that point and by way of protest against the present action of the Government that this Resolution has been brought forward. Moreover, I may say that so far as these resettlements are concerned, there are two different points of view. The ryots view it from one point of view and the Government smelling prosperity all round view it from that point of view. About four or five years ago when my district was under resettlement the Government pursued the extreme procedure of enhancing the rates of a certain class of land under the Coleroon irrigation system by $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. The then representative of the district, Mr. A. Subbarayulu Reddiyar, put up in this Council a gallant fight on our behalf, but his fight was of no avail. The same was the case in respect of North Arcot. So far as the districts of North Arcot and South Arcot are concerned, they are groaning under heavy taxation. We found ourselves helpless and impotent to get these resettlements based on a legislative basis. Now that power is given to us there is absolutely no reason why we should not avail ourselves of that power and compel the Government to fix the basis of that legislation. Otherwise, if we go on in this fashion permitting district after district to be resettled, then there will be no relief to us. So far as we are concerned we have suffered. The hon. Mover of this Resolution has portrayed to us a

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [14th December 1923]

vivid picture of the condition of the Tanjore ryots. While I am free to recognize that conditions in Bellary and Anantapur differ fundamentally from those prevailing in the Tanjore district, I would submit that that consideration, by itself, ought not to weigh with us in viewing Tanjore from an entirely different standpoint. For, one main principle which is common to both is the necessity and the determination to see that the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation, and how are you going to see that your determination is given effect to unless it be that we bring forward and pass Resolutions of this nature? Then it may perhaps be stated that while so far as some districts are concerned the revenue involved is very little, but as regards the Tanjore district the revenue which the Government hope to get is rather large because the present assessment comes to about 55 lakhs, whereas the proposed assessment comes to about 67 lakhs representing 22.06 per cent. Hon. Members of this House are perfectly aware of the fact that the deltaic area in the Tanjore district is divided into 15 or 16 tarams. I went through the report of Mr. Jackson dealing with this area and also the report of Mr. P. C. Dutt wherein the latter differs in some respects from the recommendations of Mr. Jackson and he says that the settlement officer appears to have allowed himself to be influenced mainly by one consideration, viz., the rise in prices. For instance, he says that there was no reclassification of the soil, no irrigation facilities, no commutation rates and other particulars having been taken into consideration. But whatever that may be, so far as the Tanjore mirasidars are concerned, they have a real grievance in the matter. There is absolutely no reason why their wishes should not be respected. I do not regard the answer to question No. 49 given to-day on the part of Government as the last word on the subject. It only indicates the present attitude of the Government and its unwillingness to make a move in the right direction on its own initiative, and I do not think that is indicative of the spirit of the bureaucracy that they will not any longer respect the wishes of the House provided the wishes of the House assert itself in an unmistakably strong language.

“I expect the hon. the Home Member to tell us that though, so far as the Government are concerned, they are not in a mood to suspend the operations of their own accord, they will, if the sense of the House is the other way, be prepared to respect it and not to flout public opinion or disregard the feeling that may be reflected in this House on this question of putting into practical operation their settlement rates. I do not think it necessary at this stage to trouble this House with the various figures which have been placed before it by the hon. the Mover. Mr. Jackson's report came in for a large share of criticism and in my opinion very rightly. As the Mover has referred to the outturn, the commutation rates and other peculiarities of the Tanjore district, I had better not advert to them in detail. It is thought that the Government would be put to the inevitable necessity of losing 12 lakhs of rupees a year. But so far as this Resolution is concerned, it does not want the Government to lose or surrender that amount once and for all. It simply requests the Government to suspend the operations till the rates have been subjected to legislative sanction after the whole thing has been fully discussed and thrashed out in the Legislative Council. If, when the rules are drafted, it is found that the rates are almost the same as those we find in Mr. Jackson's

3-45 p.m.

14th December 1923] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

report, it will be perfectly open to the Government to ask the Legislature to give them powers to recover the rates with retrospective effect for the period for which they have been kept in abeyance consequent upon this Resolution of the House. I submit that this Resolution is modestly conceived and in seconding this Motion I commend it for the acceptance of the House."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I request you, Sir, to state what course you propose to adopt with regard to the two Amendments?"

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT (from the Chair):—"Does the hon. Member Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar wish to move his Amendment?"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, the Amendment that stands in my name is this:—

'For all the words beginning with "that the collection of land revenue" substitute "that a committee with a majority of elected members of this Council be appointed to consider the proposals made for the resettlement of the Tanjore district, and the Government Order thereon, and propose the changes they would recommend within three months, that the Government Order be modified in the light of the recommendations of the committee and that pending the final decision, collection of revenue be made on the basis of the existing rates and that the enhancement that may ultimately be decided upon be collected as a special instalment in the last month of current fasli."

"We have heard now from two hon. Members about the state of Tanjore and about the report of the resettlement of Tanjore that has been made. The Government have passed final orders and from what I have heard there is a difference between the report itself and the recommendations made by the Collector and also between them and what my hon. Friends here represent to be the actual state of the Tanjore district. They vary very much. It has been said that when the Settlement Bill is passed everything will be clear. It will be easy to go into all these matters and decide. It is also said that when the Bill is passed, everyone will find that there is no case for resettlement in Tanjore district. I am very sceptical about this. The principles have been there already; it is only the major portion of the principles that are there, that are going to be codified and in some cases with a few modifications. But the real difficulty comes in in the application of those principles. For instance, one big question that has been agitating this Council has been the cost of cultivation that is to be allowed for, and the other the average rate of prices that is to be taken into consideration. About these two matters there have been constant difficulties. The people have been always dragging one side while the Government have been dragging just the other way. So the main difficulty is in the application of the principles and not in the principles themselves. Even if a law for resettlement of districts is going to be passed at once, I do not believe that it is going to bring about very great changes in the actual resettlement of districts. In the case of Tanjore all the materials have been collected by the Settlement party, the Collector has made enquiries and he has himself stated his view on the matter. It seems to me that this is a case in which all that remains to be done is to create an agency of the sort of a court of assessors who will be prepared to go into all these things and express their views. That is what is wanted and not an enunciation of fresh principles

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [14th December 1923]

of resettlement. It is in that view that I propose the amendment that a committee may be appointed to go into the whole question and make their recommendations. After all the Resolution itself says that resettlement will be held over for one year. If we may take the possible contingencies, if for instance our resettlement is correct and enhanced rates ought to be paid, I do not see any reason why for one year any special concession should be shown to one district. The case of Bellary was quite different. It is not only on account of the fact that the principles were not codified, but also because that the material and financial conditions of Bellary were very very bad that we agreed to postponing the bringing into force of all the resettlement rates in that district. In the case of Tanjore no doubt, as I said, a case has been made out for a sort of further inquiry. All that is possible to say about it is only that. No case has been made out for indefinitely postponing the settlement for any other reason. The only question to decide is whether Government is correct in enhancing the settlement rates to the extent of 11 lakhs. All that is necessary is to appoint a court of assessors who will be prepared to go into these matters and advise Government. If this is done, I submit that Tanjore district will have no grievance whatever. I hope that Government will see the justice of the case, and understanding that what I propose does not mean any real loss to them, will accept the Amendment I have proposed."

Mr. M. E. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—"Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the Amendment."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Mr. President, Sir, I am thankful to my hon. Friend, the Mover of the Amendment for one reason. He has, in the last part of his Amendment, been good enough to suggest that even if the Committee's bill is put in operation there is likely to be some enhancement. He said the same thing in his speech. I am glad that he has recognized that point. Because, the tendency has hitherto been to suggest that the whole idea of enhancing the rates in the Tanjore district is monstrous, and not to be contemplated by this House.

"But as regards the substance of his Amendment, Sir, I hope he will forgive me if I say that I regard his proposal as *extraordinary*. What is it that he proposes? It is that the final decision as to whether the orders already passed should stand or not should be left to his Committee. He talks about a court of assessors, but what he proposes is more like the court of appeal to which another hon. Member has referred—a court of appeal with final powers."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"The Court will have no final powers, Sir. The Government may in the light of the recommendations of the Committee modify their rules. I do not mean that it should have final powers."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I understand that an injunction is laid on Government to modify their orders in the light of the recommendations of the Committee. If that does not mean that the Committee has final authority, I don't know what it does mean. I read the Amendment as it stands on the paper. I will go further and say, Sir, that it seems to me that it is not complimentary to this Council. It comes to this: neither the Government nor this Council is competent to give a decision on this matter. They are

14th December 1923]

[Mr. A. R. KNAPP]

to refer it to a committee, not of this House wholly, but only the majority of it coming from this House and the rest consisting of gentlemen coming from outside. I am afraid I cannot accept the proposal. I am quite prepared to look at this question of Tanjore resettlement and argue it on its own merits, and to consider the sufferings of the unfortunate Tanjore ryot. But it seems to me to be very inadvisable to switch off, as it were, to a line of this kind. As I have said before, the proposal which has been put forward would really mean that the Government should place the final disposal of the whole matter in the hands of a fresh committee."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON:—"Mr. Chairman, this is a matter upon which I feel great personal interest. I have been a Settlement Officer myself for several years of my life, and therefore I think that as regards the principles of Tanjore resettlement, I would be in a position to give what might be held to be an expert opinion on the matter.

4 p.m. "I do not think that my pretensions to being an expert will be considered unworthy to the least degree. I think I need say this much that there is a very great misunderstanding about our settlement operations which I should like to correct, as to their object, their traditions. The idea seems to be that the Settlement officers are sent out with the tradition and teaching, with the avowed object of getting more money to Government. Having served under the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter when he was the Commissioner for Settlement and being taught in the matter by other men who gave me my budding ideas on the subject, I may say that that is far from being the object of the operations. In actual practice, in my time, I have found in the districts which I have settled that very frequently I may say what I had to do was not to raise but to lower the assessment. I may cite the instances of the far-off district of Ganjam and the district of Guntur down to the tailend of Bapatla where when the Settlement department left, they left with reduced assessment. I am aware that in Guntur we reclassified the soil on the sole reason that excess had been levied and the soil was wrongly classified and in consequence the levy was too high. Only the other day at Trichinopoly when I had been there I was asked by the Settlement Officer there to go in company with Mr. Seturatnam Ayyar to inspect some lands which in his opinion were too highly assessed. I mention this to say that where any land is thought to be assessed high, the first thing to be done is to report it to the Government and to the Board of Revenue for a reclassification of the land. In resettling district after district we try not only to adjust the levies between the various kinds of lands within the same district, but also to get fair play between district and district. I do not want to set district against district. But I do want to say that Tanjore has fair play in respect of its assessment as compared with that in other districts. I am sure the object of the Settlement Commissioner is not to accept any classification which is higher, not merely searching in every corner of the district to find any flaw in the old settlement, but to see whether Tanjore had been over-assessed or not. As regards the appeal made by Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar, I quite understand and respect what he has said. But I wish to mention that here he stands as an advocate of the mirasidars of the Tanjore district to try and persuade this Council to postpone at least, if not to reduce or abolish altogether, the increase which has been recommended by the Settlement Officer in his report and

[Mr. G. F. Paddison] [14th December 1923]

which has been sanctioned by the Government. I remember my first experience as a Settlement Officer. I was going from Guntur to Tenali when on the way I went to a village. When I got there I asked the ryots what the lease value and sale value of land in that village were. They came and told me that land was being sold at Rs. 2,000 an acre and leased at Rs. 50. They gave all sorts of wonderful and glorious figures. As I got these down in my notebook I asked them, 'What do you think I have come here for?' They answered: 'To acquire lands for the Tenali Railway.' Well, Sir, my point is this. I wish to impress the House with the fact that the mirasidars of Tanjore quite naturally as business men and as farmers are really anxious to make out as good a case as they can in their interests.

"Now, let me proceed, if I may, to the case as laid down by Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar. He begins by a reference to the soil classification and classification of irrigation sources. I wish to ask him where he got his idea that Mr Jackson who examined most carefully the classification of the soil said that the classification was bad. On the contrary, in at least two places, he says that it is remarkably good. He clearly says that the classification in the Tanjore district, as in other places, are extraordinarily carefully done and extraordinarily good. In regard to the leasing of the land, the value of the land as leased and as sold corresponds very largely with soil classification which proves, I think, as he says quite clearly, that relatively, whatever else you may say, as between field and field classification in the district is fair. As regards irrigation sources which he next referred to, he did an injustice to the Settlement department and to the Government. He seemed to think that we were not going to touch the irrigation sources. On the contrary in some cases, Mr. Jackson did find out that sufficient allowance was not being paid to the means of irrigation. He puts it down in his report and it has been decided to alter the margin between second and third class villages.

"Next we come to the commutation prices. I shall take first the outturns. They are most difficult to arrive at. I may tell that quite frankly. Wherever you go as Settlement Officer not only in India but in England this difficulty is experienced. I have myself relations who are farmers and I know they do take a pessimistic outlook. I have never met a farmer who did not look at the old days as a golden period when they had magnificent harvest and prices favourable, when the outturns were very good. It is extraordinarily difficult to get correct information. I do not think the figures which Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar quoted are borne out by Mr. Jackson. At page 43 of his report, Mr. Jackson says:

'I have also been able to obtain definite figures as regards the outturn on the non-experimental plots of the Government Farm at Manganallur. The bulk of the land is assessed at Rs. 6, a few fields at Rs. 7 and a small area which, though registered as a single crop, has facilities for double crop cultivation pays Rs. 8. The period covered extends from 1913 to 1919 and the recorded results are absolute outturns not manipulated in accordance with the estimated anna yield. On the 6-rupee land the standard outturn is 600 Madras measures per acre. Of 13 recorded results 7 show an outturn above standard and 6 give an outturn below standard. The average works out to 638 Madras measures per acre. On the 7-rupee land standard outturn is 700 Madras measures per acre. Results are recorded for four single samba crops all of which exceeded standard; the average yield was 797 Madras measures per acre.'

"Later on Mr. Jackson says:

'These figures furnish an interesting corroboration of the results of the oral inquiries about outturn which I have conducted in all the villages which I have visited; in most cases two scales of outturn are quoted: one without manure and the other with manure. The latter generally is fully up to the standard; the former, as might naturally be expected, is below standard.'

14th December 1923] [Mr. G. F. Paddison]

"Then we come to the commutation price. Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar says that high prices ruled up to 1918 or 1919 when this report was written. Well, Sir, what about the years since, 1918--23? If you are going to be fair at any settlement of land revenue, it is but right and proper that you should take into account the later years. The rates must be very much more high if only 20 years prior to 1918 had been taken into consideration. Again, it has been suggested that in Tanjore no years were excluded as famine years. Years are excluded as famine years in Bellary and Anantapur and they are rightly excluded. Famine in the rest of the Presidency is a pleasure to the Tanjore ryot from the business point of view."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"Provided there is no famine in his own district."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—"I am yet to hear of a famine year in Tanjore. As regards, Sir, the very difficult question of cultivation expenses, Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar went into the question of the outlay spent on the purchase and maintenance of bulls and said that Mr. Jackson's figures were wrong. Mr. Jackson has no doubt made very careful inquiries, but Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar knows more of the prices of bulls in Tanjore than I. Even after making all allowances, even assuming that Mr. Jackson's figures are right, he says that the ryot is left only Rs. 14 per acre on, I think, the average land in the tract. There is one point which I wish to mention and which has not been raised by Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar. He said nothing about wages. Perhaps he will in his reply. It has been said, I know, that adequate allowance has not been made for wages. Since the Tanjore settlement report was published, I had occasion to go into the question of wages, as I am interested in it as affecting labour conditions, and I can assure the House that this abstract and independent inquiry fully confirmed Mr. Jackson's conclusions. The figures given by Mr. Jackson are fair. Mr. Jackson has said that among the perquisites of the *panniyal* wages and mamuls are also included."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"My hon. Friend will allow me to correct him. Mr. Jackson says it is not necessary to include the maniyam. The reference is to page 52 of the report."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—"I was dealing with the question of wages, Sir and not with maniyams, dealt with at page 27 of the report. Mr. Jackson does include the maniyam among the perquisites of the *panniyal*. That is the point that I wish to emphasize. At page 27 of the report, Mr. Jackson says: 'There are still other perquisites to be taken into consideration. In many villages the *panniyal* gets a small area, generally 20 cents or less, of 'maniyam' land for his private cultivation'."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"No, Sir. At page 52, Mr. Jackson says it is not necessary to include it."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—"I will look up to it, Sir, later, if my hon. Friend will allow me some time. The main and really important thing in a resettlement that we have to consider is the change in the sale value and the lease value of the land. If, as my hon. Friend says, the best land is sold at Rs. 1,000 per acre, how can it be that the value that the ryot gets is only Rs. 14? My answer is that this sum of Rs. 14 is a very uncertain figure. The sale value of Rs. 1,000 is arrived at by an examination of the

[Mr. G. F. Paddison] [14th December 1923]

deeds in the Registrar's office of sale not at the time of the settlement but taking into account records of the people who bought and sold without any idea of what the settlement was going to result in. Then, Sir, if you look to the lease value during the period between 1914 and 1918, you will find that the average lease value per acre varies on single crop wet lands from Rs. 86 to Rs. 20. On 8-rupee lands, the lease value is Rs. 51-11-0. Mr. Jackson proceeds to say :

‘ Though these figures are of considerable value, they cannot be accepted without some caution. It must again be emphasized that in grain leases for wet lands there is usually a reservation implied, and occasionally expressed, that varam should be applied in case of failure of crop. Again it must be remembered that varam is the rule and lump rent the exception.

“ Then take the sale value or the price of the single crop wet lands. These lands are worth very little. You find that the value or the sale price per acre varies from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 240 for wet lands, and from Rs. 645 to Rs. 70 for dry lands. I may say that these figures are absolutely clear and absolutely convincing

“ May I say one word in conclusion on the general point, Sir? We are considering whether we should recommend to the Government that the settlement operations in the Tanjore district should be postponed as was recommended yesterday. If I remember aright, the hon. Members, Mr. Krishnan Nayar and Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar, maintained that there were points of difference between the rates of Tanjore and the rates prevailing elsewhere. Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar said that the average assessment in the Tanjore district is already three times as much as it is in other parts of the Presidency. That I presume relates to wet and dry lands together. Now, Sir, if we ask the ryots of Bellary or Anantapur or anywhere in the Ceded districts or in the uplands of Trichinopoly or Dindigal, whether they will pay the extra assessment at the rate obtaining in Tanjore or whether they will have the famine, there can be no doubt as to what the answer will be.

“ The next point I would urge is this. You say that the Government must postpone the resettlement. I have tried hard now to convince this House that after the most careful consideration and after the most careful enquiry by every one concerned, it has been found that this increase is fair compared with the rates obtaining in the Presidency. I would ask the House whether we should give 12 lakhs of rupees per annum to the mirasidars of the Tanjore district when all other people are howling for money for their own purposes. I am sure that my hon. Friend the Minister for Education will agree with me in this view, as he wants an Andhra University in the north, and there may be need for another University in the west. And there are other equally important schemes of general welfare. Are we going to put off this resettlement, and if so, are we going to recover double or treble assessment after two or three years' time? It is a very important question to be answered, because supposing that the House and the Government have a difference of opinion on the Revenue Bill and it is referred to a committee, there may be a delay of two years or more. So it means that we are going to give to the mirasidars of Tanjore 12 lakhs of rupees, and I would say to the House, let us be just before we are generous.

“ As regards the other points, Sir, I think I am right in saying that the proposal to have an elected committee . . . ”

14th December 1923]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ It is a committee with a majority of elected members which I propose.”

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—“ I should like, if I could, to get him to substitute the words ‘ majority of non-official members ’ in place of the words ‘ majority of elected members ’. That is a point on which I wanted to speak some time before in this Council. The gentlemen belonging to the depressed and backward classes will feel it very much if they are not represented on the committee. This House, I may say, is composed of many interests and is a model of representative bodies. It does not consist only of elected members. If only elected men are to be taken, what is the use, for instance, of my inducing the hon. the Chief Minister to put a gentleman belonging to the backward classes on a taluk board or district board? Are they in any way inferior to others? Take the hon. Member, Lieutenant Madurai. He represents the Madras Army, the Madras Pioneers, and he served for two and a half years in East Africa. He can say now what exactly the position of Indians in Kenya is. So I hope that the House will agree with me in this matter. If you are going to have only an elected committee, it will not go into these extremely detailed calculations of outturn, etc., and it will not have time to go into any detailed examination of the whole question. Much time may be spent in the course of the consideration, and the introduction of the rates may not be possible till the following fasli, and meanwhile these 12 lakhs, to which I have referred, will have gone out of the general revenues of this Presidency. I would therefore ask hon. Members of this House, regardless of party, to support me in opposing both the Amendment and the original Motion.”

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ Sir, this House exists, if at all, for the main reason that there should be no fresh taxation.”

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—“ I may say at once, Sir, for the information of the House that I do not accept the Amendment moved by Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar.”

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ Sir, this House exists for the main reason that there should be no fresh taxation without its consent. That is the general principle and I am at a loss to see why land tax should be an exception. This principle was solemnly asserted yesterday in connexion with the re-settlement of another district and asserted by an overwhelming majority, when we beheld the strange spectacle of only the Ministers voting against that principle. In this case, as in many other cases, it is also significant to notice that it is the Opposition that has been ruling the House, though the office is held by somebody else”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order. Is the hon. Member speaking on the Amendment of Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar ? ”

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ Yes, Sir, I am going to it.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I observe that the hon. Member has taken a lot of time in talking, and when asked whether he is talking on the Motion, he says that he is going to talk on it. I think I am entitled to say that it is not very respectful to the House that any hon. Member should spend valuable time in talking admittedly on something else ; and, however valuable the matter spoken about may be, it is certainly not a matter before the House. Of

[The President]

[14th December 1923]

course, the hon. Member is new to the House, and to the procedure of this House, and I am sure he deserves some consideration. I hope he will not again offend the rules."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I beg your pardon, Sir. What I have said already leads to the point. This Amendment proposes a committee of officials and non-officials who are elected members of this House to consider this matter and report thereon. It says also that the Government should be led by the recommendations of this committee. The principle enunciated by the hon. Mover of the Resolution goes further still. It lays down that this House should wait for a year until the necessary legislation embodying the principles of revenue settlement is passed. That might take very long and it might involve a loss of several lakhs of rupees. The principle at the bottom of both the Resolution and the Amendment is practically the same. But I am more in favour of this Amendment, and if it is not passed, I shall support the original Resolution, on the ground that South Kanara is also threatened with resettlement. The distant rumble of the thunder of this resettlement is sounding in our ears, and people are frightened because resettlement is a serious matter for them. It means enormous unsettlement ; it means an army of officers visiting the villages ; it means perhaps a lot of anxiety and trouble which only those who have undergone the same can realize. Therefore, in order to expedite matters, and in order that the Government might not be a loser of large revenues, I would support this Amendment. And of course, in doing so, I am reserving my right to support the main Resolution if the Amendment is not passed. I hope this House will reaffirm the principle which they have so solemnly laid down yesterday, though to some extent in a modified form, with the same practical unanimity as they did yesterday."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I wish to say a few words in support of the Amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar. In doing so, I wish to point out that, so far as the original Resolution is concerned, it merely suggests that the collection of land revenue at the enhanced rates be suspended for one year at least till the principles of revenue assessment are embodied in legislation. It does not go further than that ; it does not, for instance, indicate the further steps to be adopted for the purpose of determining whether the enhanced rates ought to be allowed or abolished or be reduced. It is merely for the purpose of providing the machinery by which it is possible to arrive at a conclusion as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the rates that my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, suggests the appointment of a Committee consisting of a majority of elected Members of this Council to make proposals in that direction.

4-30 p.m. "The objection taken by the hon. the Home Member regarding the powers which are to be assigned to the Committee no doubt deserves some consideration. Nobody would suggest for a moment that this Council should abdicate its functions regarding the fixing of the rates of assessment in respect of this settlement and should transfer all its powers to the Committee. Nobody would accept that position, and it is a position which no one will tolerate. But I take it, Sir, that the wording of the Amendment does not warrant that construction which the hon. the Home Member tried to put upon it, because in the first portion of the

14th December 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

Amendment it is distinctly stated that this Committee is to propose the changes they would recommend within three months. The mere fact that the Committee is authorized to recommend changes in the resettlement rates is quite sufficient to satisfy this House that the Committee is not proposed to be invested with absolute powers in the matter of fixing of rates. The further use of the words—

‘that the Government order be modified in the light of the recommendations of the Committee’

does not imply that immediately after they make recommendations, the Government should have no other alternative to consider those proposals than straight off passing orders accepting the recommendations of the Committee. I think, Sir, that is not the construction to be put upon those words and I am sure that the hon. the Mover of the Resolution himself did not intend those words to carry any such meaning. The idea which is intended to be carried out by this Amendment is that a Committee consisting of elected members of this House should be in a better position to examine all those proposals in detail and make recommendations as to what rates ought to be adopted in the case of the Tanjore resettlement. It is for the purpose of not indefinitely postponing these proposals that the Amendment suggests that the Committee should make their recommendations within a period of three months. It goes further and states that till the Committee make their proposals and till those proposals are considered by the Government, the old rates may be adopted and that any additional rates may be recovered by an additional instalment. Therefore, Sir, so far as this Amendment is concerned, it is one which must satisfy all the hon. Members of this House. In view of the remarks made by the hon. Mover of this Resolution, I think we can be satisfied that there is a case for further enquiry and that such an enquiry as has been suggested by this Amendment would satisfy hon. Members; and so long as it suggests that any further increase which is contemplated may be recovered later on, I do not think the hon. the Home Member ought to oppose this Amendment.

“In the course of his remarks, the hon. Member, Mr. Paddison, took exception to the wording of this Amendment in so far as it referred to the elected members of this House. He did not raise any objection to the idea of a Committee going into these proposals, but his main objection was that in so far as there are several nominated members in this Council, there should not be any impression created that they are of an inferior status, or anything of that sort, and that they should also have a place in the Committee. May I point out to him, Sir, that the Committee proposed by this Amendment does not exclude the appointment of nominated members? All that it suggests is that there should be a majority of elected members. It is a well acknowledged principle that if a Committee of this House is to be appointed, those who even to-day according to the constitution of the House form the majority, should have the preponderating voice in the deliberations of that Committee. If once Mr. Paddison realizes that this Council consists of a large majority of elected members, it is not unreasonable for my hon. Friend, the Mover of this Resolution, to ask that in the Committee to be appointed, the elected members who already form a large majority in this Council should have a preponderating voice.”

[14th December 1923]

Mr. G. F. PADDISON:—" May I rise to offer a word of personal explanation, Sir? What I said was that I would not object to the Committee having a majority of non-official members, if the hon. the Mover of the Amendment wished to have any particular majority. I do not know if I have made myself quite clear on that point. For instance, the hon. Members, Mr. Srinivasan and Mr. Virayan there, representing a large class, are representatives of a definite class of people who cannot be represented otherwise. I do not want to have any distinction made between elected and nominated members of this Council."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—" I may inform the hon. Member, Mr. Paddison, that we have not the slightest objection to nominated members being appointed members of this Committee. I am only trying to justify the Amendment as it stands. The Amendment which suggests that in the Committee the elected members should be in a majority is not unreasonable considering the composition of the Council. But I may at once state, Sir, that if an Amendment like the one suggested, viz., that a majority of non-official members ought to compose this Committee, would meet with the acceptance of the hon. the Home Member, I think I would not only support that view, but would also request my hon. Friend Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar not to object in any way to a Committee consisting of a majority of non-official members being appointed. We do not want really to make any distinction between these persons, or to exclude the nominated members. As has been pointed out, their suggestions will certainly be useful in considering matters of this description. If the Amendment suggested a majority of elected members, it was only in view of the present composition of the Council; but if the other alternative suggested by the hon. Member, Mr. Paddison, viz., that a majority of non-official members should compose this Committee, meets with the acceptance of this House, I think we can very well accept that position, and have this matter satisfied."

The Amendment of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar was then put to the House and *lost*.

Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu demanded a poll, and the House divided as follows:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 18. Rao Bahadur C. Gopala Menon. |
| 2. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 19. Mr. C. Maruthavanam Pillai. |
| 3. " A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 20. " Venkatarama Ayyar alias V. Pantulu Ayyar. |
| 4. " C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. | 21. " B. Venkataratnam. |
| 5. Mr. A. Chidambara Nadar. | 22. " Abbas Ali Khan Sahib. |
| 6. " K. Koti Reddi. | 23. " G. Abdulla Ghatala Sahib. |
| 7. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 24. " V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar. |
| 8. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. | 25. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib. |
| 9. Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. | 26. Mr. T. M. Moidoo Sahib. |
| 10. Rai Bahadur I. M. Narasimhacharlu. | 27. " Muhammad Moosa Sait Sahib. |
| 11. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 28. " T. N. Bava Ravuttar Muhammad Sahib. |
| 12. " V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 29. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdul Rasaak Sahib. |
| 13. " J. A. Saldanha. | 30. Mr. K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 14. " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 31. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. |
| 15. " Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar. | |
| 16. " S. Satyamurti. | |
| 17. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | |

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE 495
TANJORE DISTRICT

14th December 1923]

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 23. Mr. V. Madhava Raja. |
| 2. „ Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 24. „ T. Mallesappa. |
| 3. „ Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 25. „ T. N. Marthandam Pillai. |
| 4. „ the Raja of Kollengode. | 26. „ B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 5. „ the Raja of Panagal. | 27. Rao Bahadur A. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |
| 6. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 28. Mr. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 7. „ Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivag-
nanam Pillai. | 29. „ B. Obalesappa. |
| 8. Mr. E. W. Legh. | 30. „ K. S. Ponnuswami Pillai. |
| 9. Dr. John Matthai. | 31. „ K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 10. Mr. P. L. Moore. | 32. „ P. T. Rajan. |
| 11. „ G. F. Paddison | 33. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 12. „ H. Tireman. | 34. Rao Bahadur P. Raman. |
| 13. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 35. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 14. Mr. Ari Gowder. | 36. „ J. D. Samuel. |
| 15. „ P. K. A. S. Arumuga Nadar. | 37. Rai Bahadur Sir K. Venkatarreddi
Nayudu. |
| 16. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. | 38. Mr. P. V. S. Sundaramurti. |
| 17. „ Devendrudu. | 39. Rao Bahadur C. Venkataranga Reddi. |
| 18. Sir P. Iyagaraya Chettiyar. | 40. Mr. M. Ratnaswami. |
| 19. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 41. „ W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 20. Rao Bahadur Cruz Fernandez. | 42. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 21. Mr. P. V. Gopalan. | |
| 22. Rao Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Nayudu. | |

31 hon. Members voted *for* the Amendment and 42 *against* it. The Amendment was lost.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The Council will now resume discussion on the original Motion.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Sir, I support the proposition before the House and I shall state a few reasons for my attitude. First of all, the one important reason is this, that we must support it as a matter of consistency. Yesterday the House by a very large majority passed a Resolution practically identical with the present one, except that it referred to the district of Bellary, while this refers to the Tanjore district. Any attempt to explain away the wording of that Resolution by saying that Tanjore is not, like Bellary, affected by famine seems to be not very sound. If really any one wanted to support yesterday's proposition on the ground that famine affected Bellary, the straightforward and fair way for him would have been to bring an Amendment and say that as long as famine is there, the principle should be applicable there. The only Resolution that was carried was that till the codification of the principles of land revenue settlement was effected, Bellary should not have settlement. That means, Sir, that if the codification takes 10 years to be effected, then Bellary shall not have settlement during that period, whether famine continues there or not. Therefore, the effect of yesterday's Resolution is that whatever may be the state of the season in the Bellary district, we accept the principle that so long as codification is not completed, settlement shall not apply to that district. Therefore, having honestly accepted the principle that so long as codification is not effected, there should be no settlement for any district, which, I take it, is the paraphrase of yesterday's Resolution, I do not think it fair, nor does it lie in the power of any one, to say that, so far as Tanjore is concerned, that principle should not be applied because it is rich.

“ Yesterday, Sir, the hon. the Home Member threw a challenge to some of us, if I may say so, and asked ‘ are you prepared to say in this Council that although your district has been settled, you will allow other districts to go scot free ? ’ Well, Sir, this challenge has not been thrown

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [14th December 1923]

at us for the first time. The predecessor of the hon. Member threw the same challenge last year, and many of us accepted it and said that whatever might have been done in our districts, we did not want the other districts to suffer. He said that such a person would deserve his admiration, and what is more he asked us to go to the people for election after that. I was one of those who said that apart from this inter-district jealousy, apart from this inter-district divide-and-rule policy, brotherly feelings existed between members from all the various districts, and I was one of those that suggested that whatever might have been done as regards resettlement in some districts, at least the district in which there was no resettlement yet must have the benefit of the principle that no resettlement should take place until the principles of land revenue settlement were embodied in legislation. So I accepted the challenge, and, what is more, I went to my constituencies for election and stood first with the help of my hon. Colleagues and other friends there. Therefore, to raise this inter-district question and say because one district is settled, the other districts should not be allowed to have any benefit seems to be far-fetched. But we know what the effect will be of allowing the Government to go on with the settlement operations in district after district. I want hon. Members representing various districts, whether resettlement has taken place in their districts last year or some years ago, to recognize that once we allow the Government to effect this resettlement without restriction as to the codifications of the principles of revenue settlement, the only result will be that Government will go on postponing the codification because they know the later the codification, the better for them. They may postpone the codification for ever, and yet without the loss of a single pie they would go on settling district after district. I say that if that is allowed, there will be no codification for years to come, and it will be the turn of district after district to come under resettlement and even the district settled last year or this year would complete its round of thirty years and get its turn for resettlement. Therefore, if we are to safeguard the interests of various other districts, and even the interests of our own respective districts, though already settled, we should certainly bear in mind that we should have the codification effected at a very early date, and the only way to insist upon that early codification is by asking the Government to stop resettlement till it is done. Otherwise, Government will go on resettling district after district under the old *mamool*. Four years have elapsed since this principle of codification was enunciated and absolutely nothing has been done since. I am not here concerned about the Bill that is in preparation or anything like that. A Bill may be prepared in no time. The Religious Endowments Bill was prepared, brought to the Council and passed in a few months. But this short Bill of revenue settlement has been in existence for nearly two years, and nothing seems to have been done. I asked the question to the hon. the Home Member as to whether the then Revenue Member presided over the Committee for drafting the Bill as Revenue Member or in any other capacity, and the answer to that question is yet to come. The present Member in charge of Settlement must have the papers with him and he must be able to tell us if the hon. Sir Habib-ul-lah Sahib presided over the Committee as Revenue Member or in his own personal capacity. It, however, fell from the mouth of the Government Member that seven or eight experts were engaged in it. Even the present Labour Commissioner who had had experience in settlement work was probably in that Committee, as it was said that

14th December 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

people with plenty of experience in settlement work had been on that Committee. Such a Committee had already made certain recommendations and yet those recommendations are still awaiting the attention of the Government. The hon. Member in charge of this question said that we should not expect him to accept the Bill blindfold. I asked the question as to how long he should be blindfolded. Two years have elapsed since this Bill has been finished. If the Government have still no idea of considering the matter, if they are still wanting to be blindfolded, if various questions come up in the meantime and yet they keep quiet over this Bill, there seems to be something wrong somewhere. If you take the history of this question in this House, what took place is this. The House practically passed a Resolution that no resettlement was to be effected till the codification was done. I take it that it was accepted by the Government and the Government no doubt for the time being accepted the proposition, but they did not do anything practically for the codification. Then we brought in a Resolution that we should have permanent settlement. When the Resolution for permanent settlement was carried by the House, the Government seemed to have changed their opinion as regards the original proposition of stopping resettlement till the codification of the principles, and then began this stage of settlement district after district. That means, Sir, that although they have got a Bill ready, although this House passed a Resolution two years ago that the codification of the principles must take place, still it has not been done, because they have become assured of the position that somehow or other without codification they can go on with resettlement. Therefore, Sir, we should stick up to that original principle stated not for the first time now, but stated two years ago, that no settlement should take place till the codification is effected. What we passed two years ago was repeated again yesterday. For various reasons we should stick up to that original Resolution; one of those reasons will be to insist on this Government to bring out this Bill at once and have the codification effected. Unless we do it, I am sure that we will find the codification eluding us and the Government will go on dealing with the settlement district after district. It is for this reason, and as a matter of consistency in our pressing for a principle two years old which was repeated again in the Resolution of yesterday, that I appeal to this House to pass this Resolution, and I also earnestly appeal to the Government to bring out this Bill at an early date."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, Mr. President, I support this Motion on principle. It is not a question whether one district can afford to have the assessment increased and another cannot. It is not a question whether one district is subject to devastations of famine and pestilence or another district is revelling in pleasure and plenty. Sir, it is not a question that one district is subject to or handicapped by uncertainty of rain on account of its climatic conditions or another district is subject to uncertainty of water-supply on account of the Kannambady project. Sir, I myself heartily congratulate the hon. Member in charge of Irrigation for having shown so much anxiety to expedite the irrigation works. Sir, our country is an agricultural country and our irrigation is in a very bad state. Sir, it is not again a question whether the ryot or the Government is to be bound legally by the thirty years' contract. It is not a question whether 12 lakhs of rupees that can actually be had from one district is to be lost sight of and a much less amount from another district is to be neglected. It is a question of principle,

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

[14th December 1923]

a principle that the principles of land revenue should be codified, a principle that our revenue settlement should be placed on a permanent basis. Sir, a Resolution was passed in this Council and carried by a large majority, 76 voting for and 17 against, that the principles of assessment should be codified before resettlement is undertaken. Sir, I appeal to the members of the Justice party (laughter) to support this principle of permanent settlement to which they pledged themselves in various confederations they had (hear, hear). Sir, I appeal to them now to vote for this Resolution. Even Sir Thomas Munro, the author of the ryotwari system, says in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons :

‘The principle of the ryotwari system is to fix an assessment upon the whole land of the country. This assessment is permanent. Every ryot who is likewise a cultivating proprietor of the land which he holds is permitted to hold that land at a fixed assessment as long as he pleases. He holds it for ever without any additional assessment.’

“Sir, many Secretaries of State, such as Lord Ripon, Lord Northcote and others, held that permanent settlement is good for the whole of India. Now, Sir, Bengal they say is prosperous to-day because there is permanent settlement there. If permanent settlement is good for Bengal, it is much more good for our province.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“May I point out that there is an Amendment on the paper specially relating to the permanent settlement. I am not sure whether you are aware of it, Sir. I think it would be more appropriate if permanent settlement were discussed when that Amendment comes on.”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“I do not want this resettlement. We want once for all permanent settlement.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The Motion is that the principles of land revenue settlement should be embodied in legislation. The hon. Member's point is that he wants that legislation to be for a permanent settlement.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“There is on the paper a further Amendment proposing this permanent settlement. I thought that this discussion would be more appropriate then.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I think that what the hon. Member wants to say is that there is such a thing as permanent settlement and when this legislation is done it should provide for a permanent settlement. Is it not?”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“Yes, Sir (laughter).”

“The prosperity of our agricultural province depends upon the prosperity of our ryots, and our ryot is bled white. If they say that the price of corn is increasing, Sir, they lose sight of the fact that wages of labour and other necessities incidental to agriculture are also increasing. Moreover, Sir, there is another difficulty. Our contribution to the Central Government is based upon our land revenue, and our statesmen are not for expansion but for retrenchment. Now, this increase in land revenue will certainly attract the attention of the Central Government, and we are not going to have any reduction in our contribution either in the immediate present or in the distant future. With these words, Sir, I appeal not only to the Members on this side but also to the Members of the Justice party who have pledged themselves to this permanent settlement to vote for this Resolution.”

Mr. E. W. LEGH :—“I would ask whether the Amendment on the paper is going to be moved.”

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE 499
TANJORE DISTRICT

14th December 1923]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Why should Mr. Legh put that question ? "

Mr. E. W. LEGH :—" I am only asking you, Sir, for information."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have no idea as to what is at the back of Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar. Probably if he were here, he would enlighten us. I see him here and I think he would do well to enlighten the House as to what he is going to do now."

Mr. VENKATARAMA AYYAR alias V. PANTULU AYYAR :—" I am not going to move my Amendment."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The House will now adjourn and meet again at 11 a.m. to-morrow."

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. on Saturday, the 15th December 1923.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.



311 (1)
1301 (1)
-088 (1)
(38)

311 (1)
1301 (1)
-088 (1)
(38)